## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION

Juan Bermea-Ceped	a,	)
	Petitioner,	) Case No. 8:11-cv-03170-JMC
v.		ORDER
Warden Atkinson,		) )
	Respondent.	) )

This matter is before the court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report") [Dkt. No. 38], regarding the *pro se* Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 ("Petition"). The Magistrate Judge's Report [Dkt. No. 38], filed on May 22, 2013, recommends that the Petition [Dkt. No. 1] be denied and Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. No. 33] be granted. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, which the court incorporates herein without reference.

The Magistrate Judge's Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Petitioner was advised of his right to file objections to the Report [Dkt. No. 38–1]. However, Petitioner filed no objections to the Report.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." "*Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report [Dkt. No. 38]. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [Dkt. No. 1] is **DENIED** and Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. No. 33] is **GRANTED**.

## **Certificate of Appealability**

The law governing certificates of appealability provides that:

- (c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue ... only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
- (c)(3) The certificate of appealability ... shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

8:11-cv-03170-JMC Date Filed 06/28/13 Entry Number 41 Page 3 of 3

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable

jurists would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong

and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. See

Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct. 1029, 154 L.Ed.2d 931 (2003); Slack v.

McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484, 120 S.Ct. 1595, 146 L.Ed.2d 542 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252

F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate

of appealability has not been met.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

J. Michelle Childs

United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina June 28, 2013

3